

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

KIEM DUC LE,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. C06-5458FDB

ORDER OF DISMISSAL


On November 1, 2006, the Court allowed Plaintiff's counsel to withdraw. Plaintiff was to notify the Court whether he would employ new counsel or proceed pro se, and Plaintiff advised the Court in writing on November 20, 2006 that he would proceed pro se. Plaintiff also indicated that he would be out of the country between December 20, 2006 and February 4, 2007. On November 27, 2006, the Court issued orders concerning dates for initial disclosures and for filing a joint status report, mediation, and discovery. None of the deadlines fell within the period that Plaintiff would be out of the country, and the docket indicates that Plaintiff was mailed copies of the aforementioned orders.

A plaintiff is charged with the duty of prosecuting his case and with abiding by the Court's orders whether represented by counsel or proceeding pro se. Plaintiff has demonstrated that he is

1 capable of responding to the Court's Orders. Plaintiff has demonstrated no good cause for his lack
2 of attention to this case other than to state that he did not know about the deadline. On this
3 showing, the Court will dismiss this case for failure to show cause why it should not be dismissed for
4 failure to prosecute.

5 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED: This cause of action is DISMISSED for failure to
6 prosecute.

7 DATED this 6th day of June, 2007.

8 
9 _____
10 FRANKLIN D. BURGESS
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25